

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Tradomark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.

	EXAMINER
	•
	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER
	1642
evassisied int	DATE MAILED:
	ERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):
1) S. ONGAR	(3)
2) L. Myers	(4)
2/10/02	
Dat of interview 4110105	
Type: ☐ Tephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes,	
Exhibit snown or demonstration conducted: 🔲 Yes 🛂 No. 11 yes,	bilet description.
Agr ement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims	s in question. 🕡 was not reached.
Claims discussed: #11 pen DING	
	Th. T. A 1001 00 00
dentification of prior art discussed:	. U.S. I NOEST., 1991, 88:495-1004
VAN DINTher - DANSSEN et Al	(J. Rheum atology 1994, 21(11)1998-2004)
O scription of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreen	(J. Lheum atology 1994, 21(11)1998-2004) nent was reached, or any other comments: Exo called
Indicant Case will be respond	in view of above rets which TAISE
10. A + 10 A	to the the standard and was
m issue drawn to the enable	enest of the claims. The call was
courtesy call to let Applic	put Know the status of the case
7	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would reno	available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must b der the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
1 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record	of the substance of the interview.
WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTER	ntrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT VIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the r verse side of this form). If a response to the last Office in this interview dat to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.
requirem hts that may bi present in the last Offic action, a	any attachments) reflects a complete r spons to each of the objections, r jections and and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the s not relieved from providing a separate r cord of the substance of th interview unless
	Examiner's Signature
PTOL-413 (REV. 2 -93)	Examinor 5 Digitators (



UNITED S **ES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

•				_
		<u> </u>	EXAMINER]
				•
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER]
		1647	~	-
· ·		DATE MAILE		
	INTERVIEW SUMMAR			
participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT(O nersonnel):			
SINAAR		V		
(Maria and	(3)	:		_
te of Interview 6/11/03	(4)			-
te of Interview6/1//0_9				
pe: 🕡 Telephonic 🗆 Televideo Conference 🔲 Pe	rsonal (copy is given to a	oplicant applicant's rep	resentative).	
nibit shown or demonstration conducted: 🔲 Yes 📮	No If yes, brief description:		···	_
reement was reached. was not reached.				_
۸ ، ۱				
	Λ , .	- · · ·		- ,
	N Auto immune	Pisonse Mo	DELS A GUIA	_ je 60
entification of prior art discussed:				
entification of prior art discussed: ELiss, in	mic Press Son	Diega, 1994, 1	47-174 W part	
ntification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in	mic. Press Son	or any other comments:	47-174 w part	<u></u>
ntification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in	mic. Press Son if an agreement was reached, JAIM 25 + CA	Diega, 1994, 1	47-174 W part	<u></u>
ntification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in show et al, Eds, Acades scription of the general nature of what was agreed to it aims to inschoole ETLDV, is e Allowable in view of	mic. Press, Son if an agreement was reached, daim 25 + Ca Elias who ter	or any other comments: A week strow of c	menoment of larin 36 make e treatment of	-/he
entification of prior art discussed: ELiss, in	mic. Press, Son if an agreement was reached, daim 25 + Ca Elias who ter	or any other comments: A week strow of c	menoment of larin 36 make e treatment of	<u></u>
entification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in which examples the escription of the general nature of what was agreed to in fairs to include ETLDV, is see Allowable in view of	mic. Press, Son if an agreement was reached, daim 25 + Ca Elias who ter	or any other comments: A week strow of c	menoment of larin 36 make e treatment of	-/he
entification of prior art discussed: E Linds, in show et at, Eds, Acades scription of the general nature of what was agreed to in AIMS to include ETLDV, is e Allowable in view of the includes treatment of diabetes includes not only to a immune component which	mic Press, Son if an agreement was reached, daim 25 + Ca ELIAS who ter of predialities of predialities communities in ex-	or any other comments: A weeker that the those with rive disease Docrine disease	menoment of lain 36 makes e treatment of partial Bcello but also the	-/he
ntification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in show et al, Eds, Academ scription of the general nature of what was agreed to in aims to inschade ETLDV, is eather to include a treatment of distates includes treatment of distates includes the attention, it necessary, and a copy of the amendment of the attention. Also, where no copy of the amendment of the attention of the amendment of the attention.	mic. Press, Son if an agreement was reached, daim 25 + Ca ELIAS who ter of prediatrics of prediatrics common of expos krain ates in en-	or any other comments: A weekention of c where that H those with rive disease e examiner agreed would re	menoment of menoment of larin 36 make extra bando but also the but also the ender the claims allowable a summary, thereof must be	Lestro
entification of prior art discussed: ELists, in when et al, Eds, Acapen scription of the general nature of what was agreed to it aims to include ETLDV, is ellowable in view of lates includes treatment of diabetes includes the aim one fuller description, it necessary, and a copy of the amendment ached.)	if an agreement was reached, Jaim 25 + Ca ELIAS who ter S prediabilities Amin to exposite the character of the character	or any other comments: A weeken that H those with rive disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a	menoment of menoment of farm 36 make large ment of partial B cells but also the ender the claims allowable a summary thereof must be will submit	Lestru
entification of prior art discussed: ELiss, in what et al, Eds, Acaperation of the general nature of what was agreed to in a which is be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendment ached.) List of prior art discussed: ELists, in a discussed in the control of the control of the amendment ached.)	if an agreement was reached, JAIN 25 + CA ELIAS who ter Spredialitics Arminates in endoc krainates in	or any other comments: weeken that the those with rive disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Ament	menoment of menoment of farm 36 make large ment of partial B cells but also the ender the claims allowable a summary thereof must be will submit	Lestru
entification of prior art discussed: ELiss, in the et al, Eds, Acapean scription of the general nature of what was agreed to in the entire of what was agreed to in the entire of what was agreed to indicate the paragraph above has been checked to indicate NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCION in has are ready been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN Control of the sure of the entire of the paragraph above has been checked to indicate the paragraph above	if an agreement was reached, If an	or any other comments: weeken that the those with fine disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Amany WRITTEN REPLY TO THE e MPEP Section 713.04). If	menoment of make treatment of partial B cells but also the asummary thereof must be will submit a summary thereof must be a summary thereof must b	Lestru
entification of prior art discussed: ELias, in a et al, Eds, Acaperator et al, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds	if an agreement was reached, JAIM 25 + CA ELIAS who ter Spredialitics Aminutes is exponent Aminutes is ex	or any other comments: weeken that the those with fine disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Amany WRITTEN REPLY TO THE e MPEP Section 713.04). If	menoment of make treatment of partial B cells but also the asummary thereof must be will submit a summary thereof must be a summary thereof must b	Ledar The
entification of prior art discussed: ELias, in a et al, Eds, Acaperator et al, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds, Eds	if an agreement was reached, JAIM 25 + CA ELIAS who ter Spredialitics Aminutes is exponent Aminutes is ex	or any other comments: weeken that the those with fine disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Amany WRITTEN REPLY TO THE e MPEP Section 713.04). If	menoment of make treatment of partial B cells but also the asummary thereof must be will submit a summary thereof must be a summary thereof must b	Lestru
entification of prior art discussed: ELias, in a et al, Eds, Acapeta escription of the general nature of what was agreed to in a entire to inschibe ETLDV, is entire to inschibe in view of all and inschibe in view of all and inschibe inschibe inschibe attached. Also, where no copy of the amendment ached.) The paragraph above has been checked to indicate the paragraph above has	if an agreement was reached, JAIM 25 + CA ELIAS who ter Spredialitics Aminutes is exponent Aminutes is ex	or any other comments: weeken that the those with fine disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Amany WRITTEN REPLY TO THE e MPEP Section 713.04). If	menoment of make treatment of partial B cells but also the asummary thereof must be will submit a summary thereof must be a summary thereof must b	Lestru
entification of prior art discussed: ELINS, in show et al, Eds, Academ escription of the general nature of what was agreed to in laims to include ETLDV, is se Allowable in view of letts includes treatment of diabetes includes pot apply to	if an agreement was reached, JAIM 25 + CA ELIAS who ter Spredialitics Aminutes is exponent Aminutes is ex	or any other comments: weeken that the those with fine disease e examiner agreed would re ims allowable is available, a the interview. Amany WRITTEN REPLY TO THE e MPEP Section 713.04). If	menoment of make treatment of partial B cells but also the asummary thereof must be will submit a summary thereof must be a summary thereof must b	Lestru

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Secti n 713.04 Substance of Interview must B Made f Rec rd

Except as otherwise provided, a complete written statement as to the substance of <u>any</u> face-to-face or telephone <u>interview</u> with regard to an application <u>must be</u> <u>made of record in the application</u> whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

§1.133 Interviews

(b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be <u>filed</u> by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111 and 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

§ 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged or all promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete a two-sheet carbon interleaf Interview Summary Form for each interview held after January 1, 1978 where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks in neat handwritten form using a ball point pen. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, or resulting in an examiner's amendment that fully sets forth the agreement are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate paper number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is removed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number of the application
- -Name of applicant
- -Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- -Name of participant(s)) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy
 of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). (Agreements as to allowability are tentative and do not restrict further action by the examiner to the
 contrary.)
- -The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- -Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

The Form also contains a statement reminding the applicant of his responsibility to record the substance of the interview.

It is desireable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his obligation to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form witl not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview:

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary
 Form completed by the examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner,
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete or accurate, the examiner will give the applicant one month from the date of the notifying letter to complete the reply and thereby avoid abandonment of the application (37 CFR 1.135(c)).

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examiner during the interview. If there is an inaccuracy and it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth his or her version of the statement attributed to him. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication "Interview record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.